

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/511,613		HALL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Christopher Crutchfield		2466	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Christopher Crutchfield.

(2) Timothy Meagher, Reg. No. 39,302.

**Date of Interview:** 17, 20 and 25 August 2010

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

4

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*The Examiner proposed and the Applicant accepted an amendment to claim 11 to clarify the term "control device" did not intend to invoke 112, 6th paragraph by adding a recitation of structure (i.e. a processor) to the claim. Amendments to claims 1 and 11 were also made to correct minor informalities.*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** After RCE

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 4:00 PM, 5:00 PM and 3:00 PM, respectively

/Christopher Crutchfield/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2466

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)